



OVPERANSMITTAL			Appli	cation Number	09/127,767				
			Filing	Date	February 23, 2000				
JUL 2 2 2002 FORM				Named Inventor	Sarvar PATEL				
(to be used for all prespondence after initial filing)				o Art Unit	2132				
TRADEMINAS			Exam	iner Name	S. Kabakoff	JUL 2 5 200			
Total Number of Pages in This Submission			Attorr	ney Docket Number	29250-000161/L	Tuchnology Conta			
		ENCLO	SURE	S (check all that apply)					
Fee Transmittal F	orm		nent Pa Applicatio		After Allowance Communication to Group				
Fee Attached		Letter to the Official Draftsperson and Four (4) Sheets of Formal Drawing(s)			Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences				
Amendment / Res	sponse	Licensing-related Papers			Reply Brief				
After Final		Petition)		Proprietary Info	ormation			
Affidavits/dec	laration(s)		Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application			Status Letter			
Extension of Time			ney, Revocation respondence Address	Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below):					
Express Abandonment Request		al Disclaimer							
		Request for Refund			1				
Information Disclosure Statement		CD, Number of CD(s)							
Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)		Rema	rks						
Response to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application									
Response to l Parts under 3 1.52 or 1.53									
-	SIGNA	TURE OF A	APPLIC	ANT, ATTORNEY, O	R AGENT				
Firm <i>or</i> Individual name	n Harness, Dickey & Pijerce, P.L.Ç			ttorney Name ohn A. Castellano	Reg. No. 35,094				
Signature	M								
Date	July 22, 2002	<i>y</i> -							
	V								

U.S. Patent and Trader ss it displays a valid OMB control number.

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, 10 persons are required to respond to a collection of information

FEE TO ANO		Complete if Known					
FEE TRANS		Application Number	09/127,767				
/ ^{O ` ' を} 戦or FY 2	2002	Filing Date	February 23, 2000				
JUL 2 2 2002		First Named Inventor	Sarvar PATEL				
Patent es are subject to	annual revision.	Examiner Name	S. Kabakoff JUL 2 5 2002				
S		Group / Art Unit	2132 Tualandam O				
TOTAL PROBLEM OF PAYMENT	(\$) 280.00	Attorney Docket No.	29250-000161/US Tuchnology Center 211				

(4)					7 morney position (
METHOD OF PAYMENT (check one)					FEE CALCULATION (continued)						
1.		Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge ted fees and credit any over payments to:			3. ADD	ITIONAL Large Entity Fee	FEES	Small Entity Fee		Fee	
Deposit Account 08-0750 Number					Code	(\$)	Code	(\$)	Fee Description	Paid	
					105	130	205	65	Surcharge - late filing fee or oath		
Deposit					127	50	227	25	Surcharge - late provisional filing fee or cover sheet.		
Account Harness, Dickey & Pierce, P.L.C.				139	130	139	130	Non-English specification			
Name					147	2,520	147	2,520	For filing a request for reexamination		
☐ Charge Any Additional Fee Required Under 37 CFR 1.16 and 1.17					112	920*	112	920*	Requesting publication of SIR prior to Examiner action		
See 37 CF		iy status.			113	1,840*	113	1,840*	Requesting publication of SIR after Examiner action		
2. 🛛 Paymen	t Enclosed:				115	110	215	55	Extension for reply within first month		
☑ Check	☐ Credit card	Money Order	☐ Other	•	116	400	216	200	Extension for reply within second month		
FEE CALCULATION				117	920	217	460	Extension for reply within third month			
BASIC FILING FEE					118	1,440	218	720	Extension for reply within fourth month		
Large Entity S	-				128	1,960	228	980	Extension for reply within fifth month		
	ee Fee	Fee Description		e Paid	119	320	219	160	Notice of Appeal		
, ,	ode (\$) 01 370	Utility filing fee		e raiu	120	320	220	160	Filing a brief in support of an appeal		
	06 165	Design filing fee	-		121	280	221	140	Request for oral hearing	280.00	
107 510 2	07 255	Plant filing fee	· ·			1,510	138	1,510	Petition to institute a public use proceeding		
108 740 2	08 370	Reissue filing fee	·		140	110	240	55	Petition to revive - unavoidable		
114 160 2	14 80	Provisional filling	fee		141	1,280	241	640	Petition to revive - unintentional		
	SUBTOTA	1. (4)	(\$)		142	1,280	242	640	Utility issue fee (or reissue)		
	3081012	L (1)	(2)	<u> </u>	143	460	243	230	Design issue fee		
2. EXTRA CLAIM	FEES				144	620	244	310	Plant issue fee		
	PAID		ee from	Fee	122	130	122	130	Petitions to the Commissioner		
Total	7		elow r	Paid	123	50	123	50	Processing fee under 37 CFR 1.17 (q)		
Claims	- 20 ** =	×	= إ	•	126	180	126	180	Submission of Information Disclosure Stmt		
Independent Claims Multiple	-3** =	0 ×	=	0	581	40	581	40	Recording each patent assignment per property (times number of properties)		
Dependent	S!! 5 4	× [= [0	146	740	246	370	Filing a submission after final rejection (37 CFR § 1.129(a))		
Large Entity Fee Fee Code (\$)	Small Enti Fee Fee Code (\$)	•	ion		149	740	249	370	For each additional invention to be examined (37 CFR § 1.129(b))		
103 18	203 9	Claims in exce	ess of 20		179	740	279	370	Request for Continued Examination (RCE)		
102 84	202 42	Independent o	Independent claims in excess of 3		169	900	169	900	Request for expedited examination		
104 280	204 140		ultiple dependent claim, if not paid		,00	300	100	550	of a design application		
109 84	209 42	** Reissue ind original patent	Reissue independent claims over								
110 18	** Reissue claims in excess of 20 and				Other fee (specify) Certified Copy of patent application						
SUBTOTAL (2) (\$) 0 *Reduced by Basic Filing Fee Paid SUBTOTAL (3) (\$) 280.00						.00					
**or number previous	sly paid, if greate	r: For Reissues, see	e above								

SUBMITTED BY				Con	nplete (if applicable)
Name (Print/Type)	John A. Castellage	Registration No. Attorney/Agent)	35,094	Telephone	703-390-3030
Signature		1/	<u>-</u>	Date	July 22, 2002

PATENT 726-02

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant:

Sarvar PATEL

Conf.:

1713

JUL 2 5 2002

Appl. No.:

09/127,767

Group:

2132

Technology Center 2100

Filed:

February 23, 2000

Examiner:

S. Kabakoff

For:

METHOD FOR TWO

PARTY AUTHENTICATION

AND KEY

AGREEMENT

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

July 22, 2002

Washington, D.C. 20231

REPLY BRIEF

Sir:

Applicants respectfully request an Oral Hearing under 37 C.F.R. § 1.194(b) and include the \$280.00 fee as specified under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(d).

REBUTTAL AND REMARKS

This reply brief is in response to the Examiner's Answer, Paper No. 12, mailed May 21, 2002.

REBUTTAL

Group I: Claims 12, 14, 15 and 18-20

The Examiner's Answer fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). In particular, the examiner has failed to establish proper motivation for using a counter value instead of the random number r_A in the SKID 3 protocol of Menezes et al. Citing 07/23/2002 CKGUYEN 00000016 09127767
01 FC:121 280.00 0P

Menezes, the examiner asserts that page 397 section, 10.9 states "it typically serves to prevent undetectable replay attacks in challenge-response mechanisms."

Appellants fail to understand how this simple statement would motivate one of ordinary skill in the art to use a counter value instead the random number r_A taught by Menezes et al. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that this statement found in Menezes is insufficient to motivate one of ordinary skill in the art to make the requisite change asserted by the examiner.

The examiner also states "one of ordinary skill sill in the art would have known replay attacks were used to subvert challenge-response authentication protocols, and therefore would have been familiar with choosing one of the three above options." This assertion is totally unsupported by the record. In fact, this assertion appears to be the opinion of the examiner. However, the examiner's opinion cannot be utilized to establish proper motivation under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Accordingly, appellants maintain that the examiner's 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection with respect to Group I is still deficient.

Group II: Claims 13 and 16

Claims 13 and 16 both require a second key be established based upon first and second challenges. In addition to relying on pages 397-405 of Menezes, the examiner now relies on page 499 as well as page 535. In modifying this rejection, the examiner appears to be piecing together portions of Menezes, which is not permitted under *In re Kotzab* 55 USPQ 2nd 1313 (Fed. Cir. 2000). Accordingly, appellants maintain that the examiner's 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection with respect to Group II is still deficient.

Groups III, V, VI, VII, and VIII

Appellants respectfully assert that these claims are allowable for at least the additional reasons set forth above with respect to Group II.

Group IV: Claims 21 and 22

Appellants acknowledge the examiner's indication that the rejection of these claims is overcome.

CONCLUSION

Because Menezes does not teach or suggest any of the proposed modifications suggested by the examiner, applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-22 are patentable over Menezes et al.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact John A. Castellano at the telephone number of the undersigned below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any

additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKEY, & PIERCE, P.L.C.

Ву

Castellano, Reg. No. 35,094 John A

P.O/Box 8910

Reston, Virginia 20195 (703) 390-3030

JAC/cah